



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/672,635

09/28/2000

Gary Dan Dotson

00AB148

8217

7590

07/08/2004

Allen-Bradley Company Inc
Attention: John J Horn
Patent Dept/704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

13

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/672,635

Applicant(s)

DOTSON, GARY DAN

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 14 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 8-13, 15-20 and 24-27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Application has been examined. The original claims 1-27 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tjandrasuwita et al. (US patent 5,422,654) in view of Santilli (US patent 5,673,361).

Tjandrasuwita et al. disclose in figure 4 that a video controller (c) for interfacing a frame buffer to a dual scan display (120) having a adjacent first (116) and a second display portions (114) with a display boundary there between, the video controller comprising a raster engine (including CRT, 102, 104, 112, 108, 110, and dual display 120) that receives video data from the frame buffer to format the video data and render the formatted data to the dual display (see column 4, lines 47-63). However, Tjandrasuwita et al. do not disclose a hardware cursor that selectively overlays a cursor image across the display boundary onto at least one of the first and second display, and first and second data paths respectively associated with the first and second display portions. Santilli

Art Unit: 2674

disclose in figure 1, a computer keyboard pointing device comprising a display (11) having a hardware cursor (19) adapted to selectively overlay a cursor image and an inherent across the display boundary onto at least one of the first and second display (because the cursor 19 can move anywhere on the first and second display portion) onto the first (see display portion of 21 and 22 or upper display portion), and second display portion (see display portion 23 and 24 or lower display portion) (see figure 1, column 5, lines 40-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the hardware cursor onto the first (display portion of 21 and 22) and second display portion display portion 22 and 23) as taught by Santilli into the system having first and second display as taught by Tjandrasuwita with et al. because this would provide the changing of the pixel value to make the cursor appear on the video display monitor without requiring the video controller software to perform the data manipulations and transfers for the cursor.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 4, 8-13, 15-20, and 24-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

None of the cited art teaches or suggests that a video controller for interfacing a frame

Art Unit: 2674

buffer to a dual scan display, wherein the hardware cursor comprises a first portion of the cursor image into the first data path of the raster engine according to the comparison of the first vertical counter value with the first cursor start address and the first cursor portion height value and the comparison of the horizontal counter value with the cursor column start value and the cursor image width value as claim 4, or the first portion of the cursor image comprises comparing a first vertical counter value in the raster engine with a first cursor start address and a first cursor portion height value in the hardware cursor; and comparing a horizontal counter value in the raster engine with a cursor column start value and cursor image width value in the hardware cursor as claim 8.

Response To Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 2-4-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Santilli does not disclose "a hardware cursor that selectively overlays a cursor image across the display boundary onto the first and second display portions". However, examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Santilli discloses in figure 1, a computer keyboard pointing device comprising a display (11) having a hardware cursor (19) adapted to selectively overlay a cursor image and an inherent across the display boundary onto at least one of the first and second display (because the cursor 19 can move anywhere on the first and second display portion, therefore the cursor can across the display boundary onto the first and second display) onto the first (see display portion of 21 and 22, or upper display portion),

Art Unit: 2674

and second display portion (see display portion 23 and 24, or lower display portion) (see figure 1, column 5, lines 40-47). For these reasons, the rejections are maintained.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231

Art Unit: 2674

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen
June 30, 2004


REGINA LIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER